

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-57 are pending in this application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 10, 23, 28, 51, and 52. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 9, 19, 20, 28-30, 34, 42-47, 51, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Wiegley* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,711,677 B1). As will be explained below, the *Wiegley* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 28, and 51, as amended herein.

Applicant has amended each of independent claims 1, 28, and 51 to clarify that a content server transmits a request for transmission of printer specifying information to a printer which is selected by the client, and therefore the content server receives the printer specifying information from the printed which is selected by the client. In contrast, the print system shown in the *Wiegley* reference includes only a printer 10 and a client 12. Thus, the print system of *Wiegley* does not include a content server. As such, in the print system of *Wiegley*, a printer is not selected by the client in the client server and a request for transmission of printer specifying information is not transmitted from the content server to the printer which is selected by the client. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the *Wiegley* reference does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1, 28, and 51, as amended herein.

In addition, with regard to claims 9, 34, and 57, when the printer identifier coincides with its own printer identifier, print permission is transmitted from the content server to the printer. As specified in, for example, claim 13, a code pointer decrypting key for decrypting the print data is transmitted as the print permission from the content server to the printer. Thus, the printer cannot obtain the code pointer decrypting key for decrypting the print data if the printer identifier does not coincide with its own printer identifier. In contrast, in the print system of *Wiegley*, a session key for decrypting the print data is transmitted along with a

session identifier from the printer client to the printer (step 114). As such, the printer can obtain the session key for decrypting the print data even if the session identifier does not coincide with its own printer identifier. Consequently, a third person with dishonest intention can obtain the session key for decrypting the print data in the printer shown in the *Wiegley* reference. Therefore, the security for the print data of the claimed subject matter is higher than that of the print system shown in the *Wiegley* reference.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 28, and 51, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Wiegley*. Claims 2, 3, 9, 19, and 20, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, claims 29, 30, 34, and 42-47, each of which ultimately depends from claim 28, and claim 57, which depends from claim 51, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Wiegley* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4-8, 10-18, 21-27, 31-33, 35-41, 48-50, and 52-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiegley* in view of *Venkatesan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,801,999 B1). Each of claims 4-8, 10-18, and 21-27 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, each of claims 31-33, 35-41, and 48-50 ultimately depends from independent claim 28, and each of claims 52-56 ultimately depends from independent claim 51. The *Venkatesan et al.* reference does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of the *Wiegley* reference relative to independent claims 1, 28, and 51, as amended herein. As such, the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Venkatesan et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 28, and 51. Accordingly, claims 4-8, 10-18, 21-27, 31-33, 35-41, 48-50, and 52-56 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Venkatesan et al.* for at least the reason that they depend from one of independent claims 1, 28, and 51.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-57, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. KYWAP007).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
(408) 749-6900  
Customer Number 25920